DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 443 EA 014 590

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Johnson, William L.; Snyder, Karolyn J. |
| TITLE | A.C.T. Administrators-for-Change-Training: Development of an Instrument. |
| PUB DATE | Feb 82 |
| NOTE | 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, (Austin, TX, February 11-13, 1982). |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Education; *Attitude Measures; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Management Development; Questionnaires; Surveys; Tables (Data) |
| IDENTIFIERS | *ACT Administrators for Change Training Instrument; Multistate Surveys |

ABSTRACT

Using a survey of 442 school administrators in eight districts in Arizona, Kansas, Missouri, North Carolina, and Texas, researchers developed a psychometric scale, entitled "A.C.T. Administrators-For-Change-Training Instrument," to assess administrators' desires for administrative training. An original 76-item A.C.T. scale was drafted and tested in the survey. Examination of the results of the survey, using factor analysis, refined the scale and measured its reliability and validity. The resulting A.C.T. instrument has 50 items grouped into seven component variables; each variable has at least five questions or items. The variables include the principalship, the school as an ecosystem, creative problem-solving, personal awareness, staff development, planning, and goal setting. For each item, a six-point Likert-type scale assesses the respondent's competence, desire for training, and familiarity with the item. The authors recommend using the A.C.T. instrument for data gathering and individual or group evaluation but not for prediction of administrator behavior. A copy of the 50-item A.C.T. instrument is attached. (RW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED215443

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karolyn J. Snyder

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

# A.C.T. ADMINISTRATORS-FOR-CHANGE-TRAINING: DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT

Presented By:

William L. Johnson
Ambassador College
P.O. Box 111
Big Sandy, TX 75755

Karolyn J. Snyder
Pedamorphosis, Inc.
1220 Broadway, Suite 605
Lubbock, TX 79415

EA 014 590

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, Austin, February 1982.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT . . . . . ii

INTRODUCTION . . . . . 1

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCALE FORM . . . . . 5

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCALE . . . . . 7

FINAL SCALE ANALYSIS . . . . . 8

Table 1: Item Numbers, Subscale Affiliation, and Factor Loadings of Administrators-For-Change-Training Items . . . . . 10

Table 2: Summary Statistics for the Final Test Version . . . . . 13

APPENDIX A: A.C.T. Administrators-For-Change-Training Instrument . . . . . 15

REFERENCES . . . . . 24

## ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to develop a scale which could be used to assess the desires of school administrators relevant to administrative training. The literature of reform analysis posits that school executives must acquire the management and organizational skills necessary for proper educational functioning, administrative growth, and institutional change.

The study itself was completed in January of 1980. All the respondents were administrative-type personnel from the following school districts: Amarillo ISD, Amarillo, Texas; Burlington City Schools, Burlington, North Carolina; Dickinson ISD, Dickinson, Texas; Fort Worth ISD, Fort Worth, Texas; Paradise Valley Unified School District, Phoenix, Arizona; Consolidated School District Number Two, Raytown, Missouri; Ritnour School District, St. Louis, Missouri; and Wichita ISD, Wichita, Kansas.

The respondents' professional classifications for the entire group (n=442) were as follows: elementary principals and assistant principals (n=229); middle and junior high principals and assistant principals (n=45); secondary principals and assistant principals (n=57); superintendents and assistant superintendents (n=18); supervisors and curriculum directors (n=77); education service center personnel (n=8); and unsigned category composite (n=8).

The scale was constructed to assess administrative training desires in seven specified areas: (1) the principalship; (2) the school as an ecosystem; (3) creative problem solving; (4) staff development; (5) long range planning; (6) planning-for-planning; and (7) personal awareness. Each subscale was comprised of at least seven questions. The scaling technique used was a 6-point single column Likert format.

Standard multivariate analysis was employed in the scale development. Factor analysis was used to examine the construct validity of the instrument. The factoring method was PA2; the method of rotation was varimax.

The factor analysis reduced the original 76-question scale to 50 items (only questions with factor loadings greater than or equal to 0.4 were included in the final version). The two planning subscales for the original scale (planning-for-planning and long range planning) were combined into one final planning subscale. In addition a goal-setting factor of six items emerged in the analysis. The factor analysis allows one to conclude that 50 items give a more or less complete indication of the seven subscales. These 50 items were grouped into seven meaningful components: creative problem solving (five questions); personal awareness (six questions); staff development (five questions); planning (19 questions); goal setting (six questions); the school as an ecosystem (six questions); and the principalship (five questions). The Cronbach alphas for the final subscales are included.

On the basis of the current data, the scale is recommended for gathering research data and for either individual or group evaluation rather than for purposes of predicting an administrator's administrative behavior on the basis of his/her composite scale score.

## INTRODUCTION

The decade of the 1960's precipitated a great deal of concern about the plight of American education. Out of this concern began to evolve response mechanisms diverse in content yet unified in the conviction that educational institutions could be made better. In the late 1960's a new wave of optimism spread as new and revised programs and materials were produced.

Responses to the educational problems took various forms. The emphasis for most, however, was placed on identifying students' needs and creating various mechanisms through which those needs could be met. Though a wave of optimism was generated by these innovations, by the 1970's the view was that most of the aforementioned reform had failed.

At the beginning of the decade, the role of the principalship was beginning to be examined. There was a prevailing sense that within the principalship lay the key to apparent reform failure. Snyder's analysis of the literature on the changing role of the principal (1977), led to the creation of a training model for principals which could enable them successfully to manage the change process. This model, known as Administrators-For-Change-Training (ACT), provides the conceptual framework for the development and validation of the needs assessment instrumention in this study. To provide the reader with an historical perspective on the changing role of the principalship, a brief synthesis of Snyder's analysis follows. Heathers (1972) concluded that the perceived failure of educational innovations to achieve their goals was generally due to the inadequate patterns of implementation in the academic institutions themselves. Anderson (1973) suggested too little effort went into preparing personnel to utilize the proposed materials and strategies. In other words, the educational leaders themselves were of critical importance if programs were to

succeed. Fantini (1976) echoed a similar conclusion. Goodlad (1975) added that an academic institution must assert its own individuality, utilizing its formal and informal structures, its own personnel, and its own particular needs and mechanisms for accomplishing its tasks.

If indeed the midmanager (principal) was a major key to the success of his/her school operation, what was lacking in his/her role definition? Goldhammer's study (1971) addressed this question specifically by examing the role of elementary school managers. Goldhammer found virtually no criteria existed for the midmanager's role. The principal was often isolated or excluded from administrative decision making affecting his/her own campus. Even more alarming was Goldhammer's finding that even if principals were integrated into the decision making structure, they generally lacked the educational expertise and management skills necessary for organizational growth. Goldhammer called for a role definition of the principalship. In addition, other scholars were addressing the problem of principal's role.

Houts (1975) and McNally (1975) reviewed the problems of midmanagement at the elementary school level. They discussed recommendations that the midmanager become the educational leader of his/her school, offering the direction for change and growth at his/her campus. They further suggested that principals acquire the management skills necessary in the planning and implementation of academic goals. In addition, scholars in administration (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1974; Kimbrough & Nunnery, 1976) were proposing the use of systems theory as a management and organizational tool. This notion does appear valid, especially when one considers that the midmanager is responsible for initiating and managing campus activities as well as coordinating the operations of the structural, technical, and psychosocial subsystems within the school.

The origins of the changing role of the midmanager in the public schools have been noted along with the assertion that midmanagement needs to assume a

major responsibility for managing the change process. This interpretation of the role of school-based administrators then necessitates that additional knowledge and competencies be learned somehow and assimilated into the existing educational system.

In the Goldhammer study (1971), elementary-level executives reported that their initial educational-training programs were limited in content and methodology. Consequently, their initial training had limited influence on their role performance. Goldhammer (1971, chap. 7) concluded from his study that on-the-job learning appeared to be a major source of influence on task performance. Nevertheless, the knowledge and skills necessary for proper educational functioning and administrative growth are often lacking in inservice training. He identified six critical omission areas where initial training was lacking as contrasted to the administrators' actual needs. These areas are as follows: (1) knowledge relating to goal setting, long-range planning, and evaluation procedures; (2) strategies for improvement and for assessing alternatives; (3) group processes and communication skills; (4) educational leadership; (5) educational improvement through resource allocation; and (6) human relations training.

Writing for the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., an affiliate of the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, LaPlant (1979) has noted there is a growing awareness that new technologies, validated programs, or more money do not in themselves cause educational improvement. The best educational ideas, if placed in the hands of unmotivated or ill-trained personnel, are unlikely to fulfill their purpose. LaPlant argued that if change were the educational concern, and all program improvement implies change, one could build a case for making the principal's role the focus of inservice efforts. In the mid seventies, Snyder devised the Administrators-For-Change-Training model (ACT) for training principals: (1) the school as an ecosystem; (2) the princi-

palship: manager of the school's ecosystem; (3) planning-for-planning; (4) staff development; (5) creative problem solving; (6) long-range planning for school improvement; and (7) personal awareness.

The primary purpose then of this study was the construction of a psychometric instrument (titled A.C.T. Administrators-For-Change-Training) designed to assess the desires of school administrators relevant to ACT training. The secondary purpose was to examine the reliability and validity of the ACT instrument.

## CONSTRUCTION OF THE SCALE FORM

After the seven subscales for the tryout instrument were selected and named, a pool of 76 questions was written to address the perspectives of the subscales. These subscales and a brief content description of each follows: First was the principalship consisting of questions embracing the perspectives of leadership, planning, organizing, motivating organizational behavior, and controlling. Next was the topic of the school as an ecosystem. Questions addressed the environmental suprasystem as well as the goal, psychosocial, structural, technical, and management subsystems.

The third subscale was creative problem solving focusing on real school organizational problems from the perspective of roles, communication skills, and problem solving steps. Next was planning-for-planning, which focused on the principal's varied tasks such as action planning and force field analysis.

The fifth subscale addressed was staff development encompassing clinical supervision, inservice training, and evaluation. The sixth subscale was long-range planning for school improvement which included goal setting, resource assessment, program planning, implementation and monitoring functions, and evaluation procedures. Finally, there was a personal awareness subscale embracing the perspectives of personality characteristics, self-concept, and administrative-style effectiveness. The questions were then randomly assigned to the test form.

Next the scaling technique was selected. It was a six-point, single-column Likert format. The one-column format used the following descriptors: (1) no training (skill unrelated), (2) no training (competency high), (3) training (awareness level), (4) training (initial practice), (5) training (skill refinement), and (6) assistance with school implementation. In constructing

the response columns for the scale, the attempt was made to reflect equidistant order in the six categories. In the continuum from "no training (skill unrelated)" to "assistance with school implementation," the categories were ordered. Subsequent frequency analysis showed a minimal number of responses to category one. The scale, from a post hoc perpsective, is in essence a five-point Likert scale with column descriptors varying from "no training (competency high)" to "assistance with school implementation."

With the inclusion of an introductory page explaining the purpose of the instrument distribution and giving directions and definitions pertaining to the completion of the scale and a concluding demographic page, the scale form was completed.

## ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCALE

The data for the instrument was collected from August 1979 through January 1980. The number of cases used in the scale validation was 442. This number was arrived at by having at least five times as many subjects as try-out items (Lemke & Wiersma, 1976; Nunnally, 1970).

Participant summary data, listing the participating school districts with dates for the data collection and the number of participants from each district, follows: (1) Amarillo, Texas (Amarillo Independent School District, August and September 1979, 52 cases); (2) Burlington, North Carolina (Burlington City Schools, August and September 1979, 23 cases); (3) Dickinson, Texas (Dickinson Independent School District, November 1979, 16 cases); (4) Fort Worth, Texas (Fort Worth Independent School District, January 1980, 195 cases); (5) Phoenix, Arizona (Paradise Valley Unified School District, January 1980, 15 cases); (6) Raytown, Missouri (Consolidated School District Number Two, October 1979, 31 cases); (7) St. Louis, Missouri (Ritenour School District, November 1979, 23 cases); (8) Wichita, Kansas (Wichita Independent School District, January 1980, 84 cases); and (9) separate responses (three cases).

The respondents' professional classifications and group totals are as follows: (1) elementary principals and assistant principals (229 cases); (2) middle and junior high principals and assistant principals (45 cases); (3) secondary principals and assistant principals (57 cases); (4) superintendents and assistant superintendents (18 cases); (5) supervisors and curriculum directors (77 cases); (6) education service center personnel (eight cases); and (7) unsigned category composite (eight cases).

## FINAL SCALE ANALYSIS

The collected pool of data was submitted to factor and subscale analyses (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). Instrument validity was established by two methods. First content validity involves essentially the systematic examination of the scale content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the domain to be measured (Anastasi, 1976; Ebel, 1956; Huddleston, 1956; Lennon, 1956). Representative selection of items and sensible test construction are cited by Nunnally (1967) as the standard means of ensuring content validity.

The content validity of the ACT scale was established therefore in the following manner: each subscale area was reviewed and questions were written which were believed to be representative of the beheviors, attitudes, or characteristics to be measured.

Next construct validity was established. The construct validity of a test is the extent to which the test may be said to measure a theoretical construct or trait (Anastasi, 1976). Essential to the notion of construct validity is the internal consistency of the items (Nunnally, 1967). Of particular relevance to construct validity is factor analysis. Lemke and Wiersma (1976) have stated that factor analysis is in fact a method for establishing construct validity. Essentially, factor analysis is a refined technique for analyzing the interrelationships of behavioral data, simplifying the description of data by reducing the number of necessary variables or dimensions (Anastasi, 1976; Kim & Mueller, 1978). A stepwise factor analysis was applied specifically to examine the way in which the scale items grouped together. The factoring method was PA2; the method of rotation was varimax.

Specifically scale items were retained in the instrument only if they had a factor loading greater than or equal to .40. The rule of thumb often used in this context is to consider factor loadings less than .30 as not substantial (Kim & Mueller, 1978).

Evaluation of the reliability of the instrument was accomplished through use of the Kuder-Richardson generalized reliability formula, coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951; Ebel, 1965; Novick & Lewis, 1967). This formula was appropriate since a Likert scaling format was employed in the instrument form.

Application of Cronbach's alpha to all the collected data for the final test version yielded a reliability coefficient of .96, which is considerably higher than the minimum value of .50 often cited as necessary for the evaluation of group achievement and slightly larger than the value of .90 cited as necessary for the assessment of individual achievement (Cronbach, 1970). Anastasi (1976) has posited that it is desirable for reliability coefficients to fall in the range of .80s or .90s. The reliability of the instrument was shown to be high.

Table 1 indicates that 50 items remained in the ACT scale following the elimination of 26 items suggested as inappropriate by the factor analysis. The two planning subscales for the original scale (planning-for-planning and long-range planning) were combined into one final planning subscale. In addition a Goal-Setting factor of six items emerged in the analysis. The factor analysis allows one to conclude that 50 items give a more or less complete indication of the seven training areas. These 50 items can be grouped into seven meaningful components: creative problem solving (five questions); personal awareness (six questions); staff development (five questions); planning (19 questions); goal setting (six questions); the school as an ecosystem (six questions); and the principalship (five questions).

TABLE 1

ITEM NUMBERS, SUBSCALE AFFILIATION, AND FACTOR LOADINGS OF ADMINISTRATORS-FOR-CHANGE-TRAINING ITEMS

| Item Number Initial Version | Item Number Final Version | Specific Subscale | Factor Loading |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2 | Planning | 0.53643 |
| 26 | 19 | Planning | 0.44132 |
| 28 | 20 | Planning | 0.42469 |
| 34 | 23 | Planning | 0.56416 |
| 44 | 28 | Planning | 0.48922 |
| 45 | 29 | Planning | 0.54881 |
| 47 | 30 | Planning | 0.40853 |
| 48 | 31 | Planning | 0.53440 |
| 52 | 33 | Planning | 0.47156 |
| 53 | 34 | Planning | 0.43055 |
| 54 | 35 | Planning | 0.45006 |
| 58 | 37 | Planning | 0.50075 |
| 60 | 38 | Planning | 0.52190 |
| 62 | 39 | Planning | 0.65509 |
| 64 | 40 | Planning | 0.54036 |
| 68 | 44 | Planning | 0.40738 |
| 72 | 46 | Planning | 0.53442 |
| 74 | 48 | Planning | 0.55914 |
| 75 | 49 | Planning | 0.57047 |
| 18 | 14 | Principalship | 0.41312 |
| 23 | 17 | Principalship | 0.44634 |
| 24 | 18 | Principalship | 0.40187 |
| 33 | 22 | Principalship | 0.56485 |
| 35 | 24 | Principalship | 0.52183 |
| 40 | 26 | Personal Awareness | 0.73853 |
| 42 | 27 | Personal Awareness | 0.73157 |
| 51 | 32 | Personal Awareness | 0.40379 |
| 55 | 36 | Personal Awareness | 0.64508 |
| 71 | 45 | Personal Awareness | 0.69274 |
| 73 | 47 | Personal Awareness | 0.52278 |
| 13 | 10 | Creative Problem Solving | 0.64388 |
| 14 | 11 | Creative Problem Solving | 0.67645 |
| 15 | 12 | Creative Problem Solving | 0.46134 |
| 16 | 13 | Creative Problem Solving | 0.45535 |
| 19 | 15 | Creative Problem Solving | 0.40104 |
| 30 | 21 | Staff Development | 0.41496 |
| 65 | 41 | Staff Development | 0.71802 |

TABLE 1--Continued

| Item Number Initial Version | Item Number Final Version | Specific Subscale | Factor Loading |
|---|---|---|---|
| 66 | 42 | Staff Development | 0.46332 |
| 67 | 43 | Staff Development | 0.71799 |
| 76 | 50 | Staff Development | 0.46679 |
| 10 | 7 | School As An Ecosystem | 0.40592 |
| 11 | 8 | School As An Ecosystem | 0.71327 |
| 12 | 9 | School As An Ecosystem | 0.71176 |
| 21 | 16 | School As An Ecosystem | 0.36231 |
| 38 | 25 | School As An Ecosystem | 0.30542 |
| 1 | 1 | Goal Setting | 0.53643 |
| 2 | 2 | Goal Setting | 0.42218 |
| 3 | 3 | Goal Setting | 0.53402 |
| 4 | 4 | Goal Setting | 0.46474 |
| 6 | 5 | Goal Setting | 0.48904 |
| 8 | 6 | Goal Setting | 0.46491 |

The Cronbach alphas for these subscales follow: creative problem solving (.82); personal awareness (.86); staff development (.82); planning (.94); the school as an ecosystem (.76); the principalship (.82); and goal setting (.82).

A comment is perhaps warranted pertaining to the school as an ecosystem subscale. On the factor analysis, questions 20 and 27 were placed into this factor. The alpha value of the seven question subscale was .82. Both questions were discarded, however, because they clearly did not belong in the subscale. Since both questions related to clinical supervision, it was believed that the participants were unfamiliar with the notions of clinical supervision. Their response patterns did, however, place these two questions into the ecosystem subscale. The remaining five questions for the subscale had an alpha value of .76. The Cronbach value for the entire instrument was .96. Table 2 indicates summary statistics for the 50 items in the final version of the instrument. Listed are item communalities, means (M), Medians (Mdn), modes (Mo), standard deviations (SD), and standard errors (SE). The instrument in its final form is included in Appendix A.

The A.C.T. Administrators-For-Change-Training scale represents a significant step toward assessment of the desires of school administrators relevant to administrative training. The instrument has been shown to be a reliable and valid psychometric scale. Because of the high reliability measures, the instrument can be used either for individual or group assessment. Separate administration of the subscales for individual assessment would not be appropriate, except for the planning subscale which has an acceptable Cronbach alpha value. Group assessment using all the subscales individually would be appropriate.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR THE FINAL TEST VERSION

| Item Number Final Version | Communality | M | Mdn | Mo | SD | SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.45966 | 3.658 | 3.750 | 5 | 1.442 | 0.069 |
| 2 | 0.49748 | 3.803 | 4.014 | 5 | 1.438 | 0.068 |
| 3 | 0.53785 | 3.756 | 4.057 | 5 | 1.512 | 0.072 |
| 4 | 0.55876 | 3.914 | 4.347 | 5 | 1.484 | 0.071 |
| 5 | 0.44801 | 3.466 | 3.320 | 2 | 1.452 | 0.069 |
| 6 | 0.52804 | 3.738 | 4.035 | 5 | 1.510 | 0.072 |
| 7 | 0.40652 | 3.864 | 4.044 | 5 | 1.406 | 0.067 |
| 8 | 0.64550 | 3.448 | 3.437 | 3 | 1.388 | 0.066 |
| 9 | 0.58510 | 3.260 | 3.273 | 3 | 1.421 | 0.068 |
| 10 | 0.56622 | 3.941 | 4.236 | 5 | 1.362 | 0.065 |
| 11 | 0.68830 | 4.090 | 4.560 | 5 | 1.377 | 0.066 |
| 12 | 0.45709 | 3.900 | 4.061 | 5 | 1.311 | 0.062 |
| 13 | 0.52961 | 4.145 | 4.523 | 5 | 1.344 | 0.064 |
| 14 | 0.51157 | 3.860 | 4.124 | 5 | 1.373 | 0.065 |
| 15 | 0.59612 | 4.106 | 4.572 | 5 | 1.408 | 0.067 |
| 16 | 0.47208 | 3.468 | 3.458 | 5 | 1.432 | 0.068 |
| 17 | 0.58380 | 3.957 | 4.523 | 5 | 1.471 | 0.070 |
| 18 | 0.53447 | 4.016 | 4.386 | 5 | 1.364 | 0.065 |
| 19 | 0.52903 | 3.891 | 4.114 | 5 | 1.381 | 0.066 |
| 20 | 0.53979 | 3.934 | 4.133 | 5 | 1.333 | 0.063 |
| 21 | 0.52449 | 3.835 | 4.124 | 5 | 1.404 | 0.067 |
| 22 | 0.57280 | 3.905 | 4.272 | 5 | 1.357 | 0.065 |
| 23 | 0.59578 | 3.706 | 3.868 | 5 | 1.432 | 0.068 |
| 24 | 0.59050 | 3.921 | 4.181 | 5 | 1.340 | 0.064 |
| 25 | 0.54558 | 3.654 | 3.786 | 5 | 1.501 | 0.071 |
| 26 | 0.66280 | 3.903 | 4.167 | 5 | 1.389 | 0.066 |
| 27 | 0.67418 | 3.928 | 4.253 | 5 | 1.362 | 0.065 |
| 28 | 0.48750 | 3.912 | 4.235 | 5 | 1.433 | 0.068 |
| 29 | 0.58159 | 3.876 | 4.179 | 5 | 1.437 | 0.068 |
| 30 | 0.62966 | 3.905 | 4.329 | 5 | 1.451 | 0.069 |
| 31 | 0.56524 | 3.876 | 4.123 | 5 | 1.437 | 0.068 |
| 32 | 0.44634 | 3.941 | 4.191 | 5 | 1.341 | 0.064 |
| 33 | 0.60779 | 3.744 | 3.925 | 5 | 1.430 | 0.068 |
| 34 | 0.58177 | 3.867 | 4.081 | 5 | 1.334 | 0.063 |
| 35 | 0.53460 | 3.842 | 4.075 | 5 | 1.475 | 0.070 |
| 36 | 0.56484 | 4.072 | 4.506 | 5 | 1.370 | 0.065 |
| 37 | 0.63752 | 3.729 | 3.923 | 5 | 1.514 | 0.072 |
| 38 | 0.59904 | 3.758 | 4.076 | 5 | 1.482 | 0.071 |
| 39 | 0.69267 | 4.034 | 4.542 | 5 | 1.384 | 0.066 |
| 40 | 0.53887 | 4.034 | 4.448 | 5 | 1.376 | 0.065 |
| 41 | 0.65279 | 4.066 | 4.537 | 5 | 1.365 | 0.065 |

TABLE 2 Continued

| Item Number Final Version | Communality | M | Mdn | Mo | SD | SE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 42 | 0.55061 | 3.989 | 4.322 | 5 | 2.320 | 0.063 |
| 43 | 0.63096 | 4.131 | 4.539 | 5 | 1.346 | 0.064 |
| 44 | 0.59563 | 3.869 | 4.134 | 5 | 1.426 | 0.068 |
| 45 | 0.62612 | 3.828 | 4.073 | 5 | 1.387 | 0.066 |
| 46 | 0.58401 | 3.708 | 3.890 | 5 | 1.498 | 0.071 |
| 47 | 0.56754 | 3.910 | 4.314 | 5 | 1.376 | 0.065 |
| 48 | 0.61219 | 3.955 | 4.511 | 5 | 1.488 | 0.071 |
| 49 | 0.55036 | 3.697 | 3.900 | 5 | 1.445 | 0.069 |
| 50 | 0.66471 | 4.167 | 4.743 | 5 | 1.507 | 0.072 |

## APPENDIX A

## A.C.T. ADMINISTRATORS-FOR-CHANGE-TRAINING

## INSTRUMENT

## Introduction

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain pertinent information regarding your administrative role, knowledge, skill and desire for training. The information will be used to plan training sessions for administrative personnel. The questionnaire contains a list of selectively-designed questions pertaining to knowledge and skills that are required of educational administrators.

## Directions

On the following pages, read the statements describing various administrative skills. Then indicate the extent of your interest or desire for training by circling a number in the left-hand column. The following definitions may be used to guide your responses:

1) No Training (Skill Unrelated) - - You do not desire training in the practice or procedure because you feel the skill is unrelated to your administrative task/assignment.

2) No Training (Competency High) - - You do not desire training in the practice or procedure because you feel your degree of competency is high.

3) Training: Awareness Level - - You are unfamiliar with the practice or process, and would prefer a short overview to acquaint yourself.

4) Training: Initial Practice - - You are vaguely familiar with the practice or process, or your knowledge is only cursory; you would prefer training to begin at the introductory level.

5) Training: Skill Refinement - - You are familiar with the practice or process, have had some training (or are currently undergoing training), and desire more training; you would prefer training to begin at an intermediate or advanced level.

6) Assistance with School Implementation - - You are familiar with the practice or process; you feel that you need actual assistance in implementing the skill in your school environment.

Copyright © 1982 by Karolyn J. Snyder. All rights reserved. No part of this instrument may be used or reproduced in whole or in part, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission.

**IMMEDIATE DESIRE**

| | No Training (Skill Unrelated) | | Training: Awareness Level | Training: Initial Practice | Training: Skill Refinement | Assistance with School Implementation | Statement of Skill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying personal factors that foster school leadership. |
| (2) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Deciding specific actions (events) that need to occur in order to accomplish my school (district) goals. |
| (3) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Planning for the involvement of parents, students and staff in setting school goals. |
| (4) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying appropriate learning activities for inservice programs. |
| (5) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying my beliefs in regard to staff/student learning, growth, school organization and instruction. |
| (6) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Organizing the school organization around school goals. |
| (7) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Integrating external school pressures, guidelines and policies with internal school (district) needs and goals. |
| (8) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying the subsystems of school (district) organization and their effects on school performance. |

**IMMEDIATE DESIRE**

| | No Training (Skill Unrelated) | No Training (Competency High) | Training: Awareness Level | Training: Initial Practice | Training: Skill Refinement | Assistance with School Implementation | Statement of Skill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (9) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Analyzing a school (district) as an ecosystem. |
| (10) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Developing group creative problem-solving skills. |
| (11) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Leading a staff toward creative solutions to problems. |
| (12) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Categorizing multiple possibilities into workable strategies. |
| (13) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Determining annual strategies for individual teacher improvement. |
| (14) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Determining when to intervene in the school improvement process. |
| (15) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Linking teacher performance standards and plans to school goals and to teacher evaluation. |
| (16) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying the sources of and the categories for school (district) goals. |

IMMEDIATE DESIRE

| | No Training (Skill Unrelated) | No Training (Competency High) | Training: Awareness Level | Training: Initial Practice | Training: Skill Refinement | Assistance with School Implementation | Statement of Skill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (17) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Keeping a school staff on an agreed-upon course of activities and practices. |
| (18) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Developing strategies for supervisory conference feedback. |
| (19) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Evaluating the effects of goal implementation. |
| (20) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Altering the influence of forces at work to accomplish my school (district) goals more effectively. |
| (21) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Developing pre-observation conference planning techniques for supervision. |
| (22) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Critiquing ideas while keeping communications open. |
| (23) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying the focus for and prioritizing school goals. |
| (24) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Critiquing problem solutions until they are acceptable and workable. |
| (25) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Managing the boundaries between internal (school/community) and external (district/state) pressures for change. |

IMMEDIATE DESIRE

| | No Training (Skill Unrelated) | No Training (Competency High) | Training: Awareness Level | Training: Initial Practice | Training: Skill Refinement | Assistance with School Implementation | Statement of Skill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (26) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying my personality characteristics and their influence on my leadership effectiveness. |
| (27) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying personal leadership style and its effect on my performance. |
| (28) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Assessing the growth needs of my school organization. |
| (29) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Linking annual school goals to team and to teacher goals. |
| (30) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Linking school goals to teacher evaluation. |
| (31) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Developing a time-line of events so that my goals will be accomplished. |
| (32) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Increasing my vision of what is possible in my school (district). |
| (33) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Analyzing available resources for school activities. |

IMMEDIATE DESIRE

| | No Training (Skill Unrelated) | No Training (Competency High) | Training: Awareness Level | Training: Initial Practice | Training: Skill Refinement | Assistance with School Implementation | Statement of Skill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (34) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying the various forces at work and their negative and positive influence on my school goals. |
| (35) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Ensuring that school goals reflect the concerns of the entire school community. |
| (36) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Determining the combined effect of my personality, self-concept, leadership and beliefs on my job performance. |
| (37) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Developing a school-wide goal setting process. |
| (38) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Prioritizing activities to accomplish school goals. |
| (39) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Developing strategies for accomplishing school goals. |
| (40) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying individual and total staff growth needs. |
| (41) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Developing procedures for collecting and analyzing data from classroom observations. |
| (42) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Clarifying and analyzing problems succinctly. |

IMMEDIATE DESIRE

| | No Training (Skill Unrelated) | No Training (Competency High) | Training: Awareness Level | Training: Initial Practice | Training: Skill Refinement | Assistance with School Implementation | Statement of Skill |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (43) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Developing skill in identifying and utilizing various methodologies for classroom observation. |
| (44) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Sequencing learning activities in in-service programs to foster desired growth. |
| (45) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Identifying my self-concept strengths and weaknesses and their effects on my goals. |
| (46) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Conducting monthly or quarterly evaluation of school improvement plans and accomplishments. |
| (47) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Assessing my own professional growth needs. |
| (48) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Controlling school activities so that goals are accomplished. |
| (49) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Setting short range project goals. |
| (50) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Evaluating teacher performance. |

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please mark the appropriate blank. Feel free to add comments when you feel that they are applicable.

JOB TITLE which best describes your position:

____principal ____assistant principal
____superintendent ____assistant superintendent
____supervisor or curriculum director
____education service center personnel ____university faculty

DIVISION(S) for which you are responsible:

___ elementary ___ middle or junior high school ___ high school

SIZE of school district (region):

____less than 500 scholastics
____500-2,000 scholastics
____more than 2,000 scholastics

SETTING of school district is mainly:

____urban ____suburban ____rural

MAJOR ECONOMIC support for the community comes from (one or more):

____agriculture ____oil ____military ____ ranching
____no dominant industry or trade ____other: Specify_____

ETHNIC BREAKDOWN (rough percentage) of your school community:

____%Anglo ____%Black ____%Spanish-speaking __%Non-American
____%Indian ____%Other: Specify_____

PARTICIPANT'S NAME _____

_____

MAILING ADDRESS _____

_____

_____

ZIP CODE_____

DATE_____

REFERENCES

Anastasi, A. Psychological testing (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1976.

Anderson, R. H. Education in anticipation of tomorrow. Worthington, Ohio: Chas. A. Jones Pub. Co., 1973.

Cronbach, L. J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 1951, 16, 297-334.

Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of psychological testing. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Ebel, R. L. Obtaining and reporting evidence on content validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1956, 16, 269-282.

Ebel, R. L. Measuring educational achievement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Fantini, M. D., (Ed.). Alternative education: a source book for parents, teachers and administrators. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1976.

Goldhammer, K. Elementary principals and their schools. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, 1971.

Goodlad, J. I. Dynamics of educational change. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.

Heathers, G. Overview of innovations in organizations for learning. Interchange, 1972, 3, 47-68.

Houts, P. L. The changing role of the elementary school principal: report of a conference. The National Elementary Principal, 1975, 55, 62-73.

Huddleston, E. M. Test development on the basis of content validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1956, 16, 283-293.

Kast, F., & Rosenzweig, J. E. Organization and management: a systems approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Kim, J. O., & Mueller, C. W. Factor analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.

Kimbrough, R., & Nunnery, M. Y. Educational administration: an introduction. New York: Macmillan, 1976.

LaPlant, J. Principals inservice program. /I/D/E/A, Inc. Dayton, Ohio, 1979.

Lemke, E., & Wiersma, W. Principles of psychological measurement. Chicago, Illinois: Rand-McNally, 1976.

Lennon, R. T. Assumptions underlying the use of content validity. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1956, 16, 294-304.

McNally, H. J. The principalship: a shared responsibility. The National Elementary Principal, 1975, 55, 22-28.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D. H. Statistical package for the social sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Novick, M. R., & Lewis, C. Coefficient alpha and the reliability of composite measurements. Psychometrika, 1967, 32, 1-13.

Nunnally, J. C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Nunnally, J. C. Introduction to psychological measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Snyder, K. J. A conceptual learning model for training leaders for change (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 4499A. (University Microfilms No. 7731165, 136).